
From: Cole, Samantha [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=49A7B2FA4F2E49DC89409A50359461AB-SCOLE4]
Sent: 1/30/2018 3:15:44 PM
To: Weiner, Sadie [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=df98bd64929043eeaab54e589dd7d1b2-asweiner]; Porter, Ford C [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b78085a114554c8ba8f58bfff3e6db0-fcporter]; Talley, Noelle S [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=34af852279554311bf577ab3b4532109-ejholl]; Little, Jamal [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=34af852279554311bf577ab3b4532109-ejholl]; Holl, Eric J [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=cd9f3882421746bcb5a60cbe82cdff89-nstalley]; Holl, Eric J [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=69149c51192e44e4ad4fc5f6b56d18ab-jlittle6]; Barker, Paul E [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=aca4172135b1438a9b6bf9ed4265f2b6-pebarker1]; White, Julia W [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=d92f33e7d43e44a9b15d6ec92e2348cb-jwbuckner]; Eudy, Ken [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=559b029a243848e7af724eed4610137-keudy1]
Subject: FW: [External] Atlantic Coast Pipeline questions

From: Dan Way [mailto:dway@carolinajournal.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Governor's Press Office <govpress@nc.gov>; Noelle Talley <noelletalley@nc.gov>
Subject: [External] Atlantic Coast Pipeline questions

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to report.spam@nc.gov.

Folks:

Sorry we didn't get a response to our questions about the Atlantic Coast Pipeline yesterday so we could include Gov. Cooper's position as a matter of fairness to him and balance for our readers.

We are working on another story, and are seeking a response again. We have obtained a copy of the Virginia memorandum of agreement, and compared it to the North Carolina memorandum of understanding. There are some similarities, but also some significant differences between the two. We would like to know:

- 1) How did North Carolina arrive at the \$57.8 million figure. Is there a specific breakdown you can provide to show the basis on which you calculated that sum, and what would be done with that money specifically.
- 2) It is striking that both Virginia and North Carolina arrived at the same \$57.8 million figure. Is there an explanation for that?
- 3) The Virginia memorandum of agreement seems to follow closely mitigation decisions that are part and parcel of the usual and customary permit approval process. North Carolina's side deal memorialized in the memorandum of understanding does not appear to follow that usual and customary process, and the governor said it is not part of the permit approval activity. Why was it negotiated outside of the permit approval/mitigation negotiation process? If it's not a settlement, what exactly is it then?

4) The Virginia memorandum of agreement spells out specifically how the \$57.8 million will be used there. It appears it is all tied to routine mitigation efforts one might expect to see from a construction project, such as reforestation, land restoration, water monitoring and water improvements. North Carolina's agreement of understanding, on the other hand, says economic development and renewable energy projects would be funded with the \$57.8 million. Can you explain what that has to do with construction of this pipeline, and give more concrete details on how that money would be used.

Thanks a million.

*Dan E. Way
Associate Editor
Carolina Journal
(919) 828-3876 office
(919) 593-4895 cell
@danway_carolina*